

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
VALDOSTA DIVISION**

MARY ORZECH,

Plaintiff,

v.

VARIETY STORES INC.,

Defendant.

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

CASE NO.: 7:25-CV-6 (LAG)

ORDER

Before the Court is the Parties’ Consent Motion for Protective Order. (Doc. 7). Therein, the Parties ask the Court to enter a consent protective order to “protect[] the commercial trade secrets and other confidential business information of Defendant Variety Wholesalers, Inc.” (*Id.* at 1). Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c), the Court may enter a protective order upon finding good cause. Stipulated protective orders have become “commonplace in the federal courts” to allow the parties “to designate particular documents as confidential . . . and postpone[] the necessary ‘good cause’ required for entry of a protective order until the confidential designation is challenged.” *Chicago Trib. Co. Bridgestone/Firestone, Inc.*, 263 F.3d 1304, 1307 (11th Cir. 2001) (per curiam) (citation omitted). Accordingly, the Court finds a protective order is warranted to protect the confidential materials of Defendant.

For good cause shown, the Parties’ Consent Motion (Doc. 7) is **GRANTED**, and the Parties’ proposed Consent Protective Order (Doc. 7-1) is hereby **ADOPTED** and made the **ORDER** of the Court.

SO ORDERED, this 4th day of June, 2025.

/s/ Leslie A. Gardner

**LESLIE A. GARDNER, CHIEF JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**